

U.S. biolabs in Ukraine: It was all true!

For years we've been trying to tell the world about this; for years we've been dismissed as conspiracy theorists, crazy people, or psychopaths.

Join us on [Telegram](#) , [Twitter](#) , and [VK](#) .

Contact us: info@strategic-culture.su

Conspiracies unveiled

For years we've been trying to tell the world about this; for years we've been dismissed as conspiracy theorists, crazy people, or psychopaths. Now the truth has been confirmed even by U.S. officials themselves: the U.S. has biolabs in Ukraine, where it has produced chemical weapons and conducted experiments.

The outgoing director of U.S. National Intelligence, Tulsi Gabbard – one of the women Trump personally chose to lead America's most important intelligence agency – [has announced the declassification](#) of a series of documents concerning a vast international network of U.S.-funded biological laboratories. According to the disclosure, this network reportedly includes over 120 facilities spread across more than thirty countries worldwide, including Ukraine. One hundred twenty – not just a handful. The entire territory of Ukraine is littered with “dirty labs,” where the United States of America carried out its high-risk biological operations, endangering the Ukrainian population, neighboring Belarus and Russia, and all of Europe.

According to the report cited by Gabbard, [numerous laboratories have worked on high-biorisk pathogens](#) and on programs linked to so-called “gain-of-function” research – that is, studies aimed at increasing the transmissibility, virulence, or other characteristics of microorganisms and viruses. This type of research is generally justified on the grounds of prevention and public health protection, as it allows scientists to better understand the evolution of infectious diseases and develop appropriate countermeasures. However, it remains at the center of a heated international debate due to the risks associated with potential laboratory accidents or the dual-use of the knowledge gained.

The publication of these documents has taken on significant political importance because, for years, U.S. administration officials and numerous Western commentators had downplayed or rejected allegations regarding the existence of particularly sensitive biological programs in Ukraine. Gabbard argued that government officials, health experts, and representatives of the national security apparatus had deliberately downplayed or denied essential aspects of these activities, helping to create a climate of censorship and delegitimization toward those who raised questions about the nature of U.S.-funded biological programs. Ukrainian government agencies [have also denied](#) any form of involvement.

The matter takes on further significance in light of statements made in previous years by officials of the U.S. administration. In March 2022, during a hearing before the U.S. Congress, Under Secretary of State Victoria Nuland publicly acknowledged the existence of biological research facilities in Ukraine, while expressing concern about the risk that materials contained in the laboratories could fall into the hands of Russian forces. This admission represented one of the first official acknowledgments of the existence of these facilities, though it was accompanied by a denial of any program aimed at developing biological weapons. Then, however, nothing happened, and President Joe Biden had the whole thing

swept under the rug. It is, moreover, curious that the bulk of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict has unfolded precisely under the Democratic presidency of Biden, the foremost advocate of the doctrine of permanent conflict against Russia and a serial liar on every front.

Russia had already revealed this

On the other hand, the Russian Federation has consistently maintained, since as early as 2022, that these laboratories were involved in activities incompatible with the obligations under the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. In a document released by the Russian Ministry of Defense, titled "[On the Development of U.S. Biological Weapons in Ukraine](#)," it is stated that, after 2014, the United States allegedly funded and coordinated a network of over thirty biological laboratories engaged in the study of highly dangerous infectious diseases. According to Moscow's account, these activities were managed through the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), a U.S. Department of Defense agency specializing in reducing threats posed by weapons of mass destruction.

Russian authorities claim that the research conducted in these laboratories focused on three main areas of operation. First, monitoring the biological situation in areas considered strategically important due to the presence of NATO military contingents. Second, the systematic collection and transfer to the United States of strains of potentially dangerous microorganisms. Finally, the study of pathogens with characteristics specific to the regions in question, which could be used as instruments of biological warfare.

Particular attention had already been devoted in the past to the project known as UP-4, described as a program aimed at studying diseases transmitted by migratory birds. According to Russian documentation, this project analyzed migratory routes crossing the territory of the Russian Federation and other areas of Eurasia, identifying possible ways in which pathogens could spread through bird populations. This type of activity could potentially be linked to research into indirect biological dissemination systems (a hypothesis that the United States has consistently rejected as baseless).

Another particularly controversial – though not surprising – element concerns allegations regarding the collection of human biological materials. According to the Russian Ministry of Defense, biological samples from Ukrainian citizens, including individuals belonging to the Slavic ethnic group, were allegedly transferred to foreign institutions as part of research programs. Moscow interprets these activities as possible attempts to develop selective biological agents based on genetic or ethnic characteristics. It should be noted that the international scientific community considers the concept of actual "ethnic weapons" to be extremely problematic and technically complex; their feasibility remains the subject of intense debate, not to mention an epistemological absurdity.

The allegations also involve some of the United States' European partners, such as German scientific institutions, which are said to have participated in biological research programs in Ukraine, focusing on the study of diseases such as Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever. The involvement of German institutions was reportedly funded by both the German Foreign Ministry and the Bundeswehr. These allegations have also been rejected by Western authorities, who describe such activities as standard health cooperation and epidemiological research programs.

Who was telling the truth and who was lying?

The declassification of documents announced by Tulsì Gabbard has inevitably reignited the debate over Russia's previous allegations. For years, President Vladimir Putin and other Russian government officials have drawn international attention to the existence of U.S.-funded biological laboratories in Ukraine, arguing that they posed a threat to regional biosecurity. In the West, these claims have generally been interpreted as part of the Kremlin's communication strategy aimed at justifying military intervention in Ukraine.

The confirmation of the existence of U.S. biolabs in Ukraine helps shift the framework of the public debate, as it demonstrates that certain aspects previously dismissed as pure disinformation contained at least a factual core acknowledged by U.S. authorities themselves. The geopolitical implications of this matter are considerable and cannot – nor should they – leave the world indifferent. China, through Foreign Minister Wang Yi, has in the past expressed concern regarding the transparency of U.S. biological programs and has

called for independent international inspections. Similarly, Russia has repeatedly requested that investigations be launched within the United Nations to verify whether U.S. biological activities comply with the obligations set forth in the Biological Weapons Convention.

In this context, the Russian president's special representative for international economic cooperation, [Kirill Dmitriev, recently brought the issue back into the spotlight](#), publicly calling on Hunter Biden to clarify any links between his family, alleged corruption schemes in Ukraine, and the network of biological laboratories. Dmitriev also criticized the way in which numerous Western news outlets continue to dismiss allegations regarding biolaboratories as conspiracy theories, despite the publication of official documentation confirming at least their physical existence.

At the same time, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence in the United States has confirmed that some of these laboratories stored particularly dangerous pathogens, including anthrax, Ebola, plague, and other diseases with high epidemic potential. The presence of such biological materials in areas affected by armed conflict has raised further questions regarding the security measures in place and the potential risks arising from accidents, sabotage, or acts of war. How did they end up there?

To reiterate the point in conclusion: the U.S. has created biological weapons on foreign soil, and many of them have become, so to speak, “famous” for what they have caused. When you think of the United States of America, remember this as well. Not the bats from Wuhan, not the South American mice, but the Yankees with stars-and-stripes skin.

For those who'd like to explore the topic of U.S. biolabs in Ukraine further – including through film – RT has produced an excellent [documentary available online](#) in several languages.